

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #10: October 23, 2013 1-3 PM Central

I. Attendance

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Tom Bradley	x
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	
DRT Member	Vern Remiger	x
DRT Member	Judith Deel	x
DRT Member	Bill Hart	x
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Ann Honious	
DRT Member	Mark Miles	x
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	x
Facilitator	Greg Cody	x
MVVA	James Smith	x
Cooper Robertson	Tom Wittrock	x

II. Discussion Regarding Request for Information on Courthouse Exhibits

Haley Sharpe Design provided the park following request for information, which was then forwarded to the Design Review Team (DRT) for review and comment along with photos of existing picture rails:

Can picture rails be added to corridors in the Old Courthouse where there are no rails currently (other than in the stairway cross halls), to match existing rails elsewhere?

The DRT recognized that there were picture rails in both public and private areas of the Old Courthouse that had been installed by NPS at different times. They felt that picture rails would be appropriate to the period and not visually intrusive in the cross halls if 1) they could be installed without interfering with any existing moldings and 2) were painted to match the walls. Hanging them higher on the wall or at ceiling level is preferable, especially if any wires used to hang exhibit materials are similar in color to the walls. Hanging picture rails at a lower level is also acceptable, but less desirable.

III. Design Discussion—Areas 3-7

The DRT spent approximately an hour discussing the design package and asking questions of MVVA. They found in general that their concerns had been addressed, but will continue the discussion next meeting.

Paths & Paving

James Smith indicated that the paths around the perimeter of the park are exposed aggregate concrete in light and dark to differentiate between pedestrian and bike paths in deference to previous comments and comments that came out of the Value Analysis workshop. They have also been moved further out of the NHL and the curves have been lessened to make them more sweeping. Finally, the proposed security walls have been replaced with bollards.

The new paths around the ponds are currently designed to be filter pave, but cost may change the recommended paving treatment.

In general, the DRT members were pleased with these changes, especially the more permeable passages into the park that the bollards allow.

North Slopes & Ely Smith Square

No comments on these design aspects. James Smith noted that the bollards at the base of the grand staircase were moved out toward the road to allow room for a gathering space at the base of the stairs.

North Gateway

James Smith indicated that details on the site furnishings and elevated walkways may change as design continues. This is especially true of the bench types and supplemental information will be supplied as these details are worked out.

James was asked to discuss the interface of the design with Eads Bridge. He replied that the current elevations where the ground and pavement meet the bridge will remain approximately the same. The current plantings along the bridge will be removed and a low footwall will be built in front of the wall with up lighting that will light the bridge walls approximately 30' in order to highlight the bridge textures. Vegetation will be denser across the road from the bridge. There are also plans that show the connection between the park and Laclede's Landing through the bridge openings and how a proposed accessible path through the bridge will be handled. The DRT decided that they would like to study this plan more before making official comments.

Parking

The decision has been made to remove the current parking garage as part of the north Gateway Plans. Few new parking spots will be built except for along Memorial Drive and specified accessible parking spots and drop offs near Eads Bridge and at Ely Smith Square. The City of St. Louis is studying parking needs to determine if any additional parking will be replaced and there is an RFQ from the City to build a parking garage in Laclede's Landing. The RFQ will be sent to the DRT to determine if this is a cumulative effect of the project that will need further study.

Berms and Grading

Some changes to the berms and grading plans have taken place since the schematic design packages. The mound between the Arch legs has been eliminated, the slope behind the new entrance has been smoothed out, and the pathways going from west to east have been better integrated into the grade. A site model is available at the park to help people understand how these changes affect the landscape and what the perception of the viewer will be within the landscape. We will distribute photos of the models to help people better understanding of the grading plan.

Museum Entrance

The DRT felt that the museum entrance design took into account their earlier concerns about the visibility of what was perceived as a viewing path that went up over the top of the entrance. This no longer reads as a path and is intended to be used for maintenance access. The horizontal water feature and other changes to the design were not perceived to be in the scope of the review. Once the large change to the park entrance was accepted, the details are not as important. Tom Wittrock indicated that the security railing over the entrance to keep people from falling or walking on the canopy if they do surmount the berm is a combination of transparent metal and glass. A materials sample will be obtained.

III. Design Discussion—Museum/Visitor Center

The DRT discussed this design package for approximately 30 minutes. Previously the DRT indicated that the only features within the museum that were character-defining and that they wanted to protect included 1. The terrazzo floor, 2. The coffered ceiling, 3. The arch loading areas, and 4. the structural columns. Tom Wittrock outlined changes to these features.

1. The terrazzo floor would likely need additional patches in places and it would be extended to the exit ramps and to new portions of the museum. The DRT did not have objections to the expansion of the terrazzo floor, nor did they see a need to distinguish new portions of the floor from old portions, although Tom Wittrock thought that that would be possible if the DRT wanted it done via color or exhibit design.

2. Noise deadening panels, lighting and other fixtures will be placed within the coffers. This will be along the same lines as what currently exists in the coffers. The DRT had no objection. Tom Wittrock will provide a detail of the proposed fire sprinkler system. Most of the sprinkler heads have been designed to come out of the walls to keep the coffered ceiling open, but one line will need to cross the ceiling.

3. The accessible route out of the museum has two options at the leg arch. One was previously developed in schematic design and has ramps diverging off from the primary route and snaking along the retaining walls around the arch legs. The

other brings everyone up toward the arch legs, but would entail raising the grade around the leg approximately one inch. Unfortunately, this plan was omitted from the plan package. Tom will provide it for the DRT to review and comment on during the next meeting.

IV. Next DRT Meeting

The next DRT meeting is set for Tuesday November 5 at 8 am Central time. The Design Review Team will finish the discussion on Areas 3-7 and the Museum/Visitor Center Design Development Packages, review their previous comments to see how well the design packages take their concerns into account, hear comments from the CRM team and formulate final formal comments on the design packages.

Attachment 1.

Supplemental Materials to be Provided to the DRT

- √ Photos of 3-D models of Areas 3-7
- Combined Plan showing approach to Museum entrance that includes both MVVA and CRP details in a unified plan drawing.
- √ Results of Value Analysis
- √ Details of fire suppression system
- √ Plan A470 from the Museum/Visitor Design Set
- √ RFQ for Parking Structure in Laclede’s Landing can be found at the web address below.

<http://stlouis-mo.gov/government/departments/sldc/documents/Parking-Structure-RFP.cfm>

Attachment 2.

Previous Design Review Team Comments for the Museum and Areas 3-7

Meeting	Original Comment	Issue Resolved? If no, provide additional comment.
4	Security barrier Conditions: 1. design should meet the guidelines for the Secretary of the Interiors’ Standards for Rehabilitation and the DRT will be judging the design against those standards;	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Security barrier design should strive for minimal visual intrusion; 3. Security barriers should present an inviting aspect, which includes permeability or the ability to pass into the park at multiple locations, should be a goal; 4. It should be clear where the barrier system will be placed—within or outside of the bounds of the Monument; 5. The S106 Advisor Team should weigh in on any additional considerations for the Design Team to take into account as the design is refined. 	
<p>4</p>	<p>Berm Height conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the berm height up to 3’6” higher than current height, with consideration for a lower increase if technically feasible; 2. Set the lobby ceiling height at 14’; 3. Lower the museum entry threshold and lobby by 1’ per Study F; 4. Maintain a sloped plaza without ramps or stairs 5. Reduce the thickness of the structural profile of the roof and lawn soil/drainage layers from 7’ 6” to 7’ 	
<p>5</p>	<p>Museum Entrance conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The circular walkway around and over the museum entrance is visually intrusive on the landscape. If a walkway is designed, it needs 	

	<p>to blend better with the turf, and at the same time prevent turf from being trampled.</p> <p>2. There is no objection to going forth with the circular entrance and seating area. There is no preference for seating area A or B. Both are equally acceptable from a cultural resource perspective.</p> <p>3. Vertical water features are to be avoided in the gathering area.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>East Slopes</p> <p>1. Option 1 is the preferred option with the following modification. The railing should end at the first post rather than continuing down to the ground.</p> <p>2. The bollards should be reorganized so that they are not so close to the cheek wall now that the tripping hazard of the railing has been ameliorated.</p> <p>3. Please consider a less linear row of bollards at the base of the stairs as a way to open up this space and make it look like less of a barrier for pedestrian flow.</p> <p>4. The current planter configuration was an attempt to develop a gathering space at the base of the stairs. This idea should be retained, although the design team should look at both sides of the road in developing this concept.</p> <p>5. The lighting feature in Option 2 is not a good solution. It</p>	

	<p>clutters the look of the modern architecture.</p> <p>6. Option 1 is the preferred option for the stairs, bollard placement and cobble border.</p> <p>7. The team would like to see possible signage options at the end of the flood wall to make it look less stumpy. Options can be presented with the schematic design package.</p> <p>8. There is still concern over the loss of the curved bottom of the flood wall although the team recognizes the effort gone into minimizing this loss. Additional design ideas in the schematic design package would be appreciated. Simple design lines are more appropriate for this feature than the option 2 design.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>The S106 Design Review Team understands that the proposed cobble border will be revised to better reflect the modernist architecture of the Memorial and looks forward to seeing the revised design ideas.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>The proposed grade change between the Arch legs to compensate for the view is acceptable. More detail on how the grade change affects pathways and the Arch legs is needed. It should not change paths coming into this general area if possible.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>The S106 Design Review team would like additional detail on the accessible paths that lead from the western entrance to the Arch legs with emphasis on how the berm will be shaped and look to pedestrians. The section was helpful, but did not provide enough detail.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>The physical interface between Eads Bridge and the Western Entrance project area needs to be detailed. What will be against to wall of the bridge, staged in the bridge, or affect the</p>	

	bridge and its setting? The S106 Design Review Team needs more information to better discern impacts to the NHL listed Eads Bridge.	
7	The interface between this project and road projects in Laclede's Landing needs to be identified and depicted. Additionally, it would be useful if the estimated amount of traffic through the Eads Bridge now and in the future, as well as any additional changes of use patterns in Laclede's Landing due to this project could be elaborated on to help determine effects both to Eads Bridge and the Laclede's Landing Historic District. For example, would there be any effect to the cobble streets of Laclede's Landing due to the use of the Landing district as a drop off route?	
7	If it is determined that the parking garage will be going, parking solutions and connected or related projects will need to go through the DRT for review, even if they are planned separately by different entities. If these parking solutions would not have been contemplated if not for the removal of the existing parking garage, they are part of the impact of the current project.	